

Information Preferences of Engineering Educators Faced with Remote Laboratory Adoption Decisions

by Steven Walter Tuttle

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

under the supervision of Dr. Zenon Chaczko

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology

February 2021

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Steven Walter Tuttle declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature:

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 14 February 2021

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Additionally, I should like to acknowledge the following institutions and individuals who, in some way, have facilitated this research. The provided support and encouragement have been always appreciated.

University of Technology Sydney

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

- Zenon Chaczko, Anne Gardner, David McGloin, Bruce Moulton, Michel de la Villefromoy

The University of Sydney

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

- David Lowe

University of California Irvine

Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science

- Paul Dourish, Bonnie Nardi, David Redmiles, Debra J. Richardson, Richard Smith

Family and Friends

- Thomas Alspaugh, Wayne Babchuk, Mary E. Brown, Emily Gillay, Walter Gillay, Victor M. Gonzalez, Svetlana Gornostaeva, Bruce Grube, Stepan Kuryarchy, Aaron J. Loft, Nicholas Markiw, Kathryn Maurdeff, Sonia Maurdeff, Steve Murray, Sophie Nyles, Jaap Overschie, Natalie Page, Frank Panezich, Maura Seale, David Schweinsberg, Bill Tuttle, Christopher Scott Tuttle, Donald S. Tuttle, James Edward Tuttle, Kimberly Lynn Tuttle, Nicole Tuttle, Patricia Tuttle, Stacy Lynn Tuttle, Jose Vadi

Particular thanks must be extended to my mother, Carolyn Zonia Gillay, without whom - for many reasons - none of this would have been possible.

Steven Walter Tuttle

1 December 2020

Preface

This study began with an initial interest in investigating the *quality* of remote engineering instructional laboratories. Sharability—that remote labs can be shared between institutions—is a particularly desirable quality. This type of exchange includes the presence of a provider and a consumer. One institution provides the remote lab; the other institution consumes the remote lab. Of course, it is possible that an institution may be a provider in some instances and a consumer in others. Though there are imaginable exceptions (e.g., subsidised use), this type of sharing should generally be equitable. This is not to say the exchange is necessarily ‘in-kind’ or lab-for-lab. There are other markers of value, including money and goodwill. When considering the relative worth of a remote lab, it is necessary to address the matter of quality. However, quality is difficult to define and measure. Quality metrics are typically used to assess this measure of quality. These quality metrics are derived from quality criteria, which are derived from quality factors, which originate in expert opinion.

While this study is not about quality, it is an important factor when considering fair exchange for sharing. However, until such sharing is commonplace, the matter of relative lab worth is a moot point. This is not to say that remote lab quality is not of interest in and of itself, only that, until remote lab utilisation reaches some threshold, assessing quality is secondary to increasing remote lab utilisation. The realisation that utilisation is a precondition prompted a shift of attention for the present study. Although quality, to my mind, is an interesting (and more difficult) question, it is more urgent to address the matter of utilisation.

The general question then becomes: ‘what are the possible mechanisms that will increase remote lab utilisation’? This study is based on the assumption that increased utilisation is desirable. Various strategies—including institutional mandate, student demand, government intervention, and/or private-sector incentives—might be employed to increase remote lab utilisation. However, as a result of discussions with colleagues, I identified one particular mechanism that would have a positive impact on remote lab utilisation. This mechanism would be for a teacher to say to students: ‘you will use a remote lab if you wish to pass my subject’. More specifically, one way to attain increased remote lab utilisation would be for engineering teachers to assign remote lab activities to their students.

How, though, does one go about getting teachers to do this?

In the end, it is teachers' responsibility to decide whether to adopt a remote lab for teaching purposes. This claim is predicated on the assumptions that a remote laboratory is available for use and that the choice of laboratory mode is a decision made by a teacher (except in the case of administration-imposed requirements). To make an informed decision, teachers need information about a given remote lab to support a decision concerning whether to use it in support of teaching and learning. To address this issue, this study is based on the question: *What information about remote labs would be most helpful for engineering educators when deciding whether to use a remote lab in the context of their teaching?*

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	8
List of Figures	11
Abstract.....	12
Chapter 1: Introduction	14
Purpose, Objective, Contribution, and Significance.....	14
Other Possible Directions	19
Research Program Overview	20
Analysis of the Primary Research Question	21
Methodology Overview	24
Delimitations.....	25
Assumptions.....	25
Thesis Structure	26
Human Research Ethics Committee Clearance	27
Peer-reviewed Publications	28
Chapter 2: Literature Review	29
Background and Context.....	29
The Laboratory	29
The Purpose of Labs in Education.....	31
Laboratories in Engineering.....	33
Remote Labs	36
Remote Labs in Engineering	39
Adopting Remote Labs	40
Teachers' Decision-Making in Adopting Technology-Based Instructional Approaches	42
UTAUT as a Decision Framework for Technology Adoption	44
UTAUT Background	44
Relevance of the UTAUT in Adopting Remote Laboratories	46
Chapter 3: Phase I: Best-Worst-Scaling	51
Research Design and Preparation.....	51
Best-Worst-Scaling: A Stated-Choice Survey Methodology	52
Intended Cohort.....	53
Gathering Remote Laboratory Information Characteristics.....	53
Grouping Characteristics into Aggregates	55
Procedure for Grouping Remote Laboratory Information Characteristics	56
Remote Laboratory Information Taxonomy	57
Taxonomic Verification and Validation.....	64
Best-Worst-Scaling Participants	65
Data Collection	68
Results	71
Raw Results: Phase I Best-Worst-Scaling.....	78
Descriptive Statistics	87
Discussion	97
Chapter 4: Phase II: Quasi Experiment.....	98
Research Design & Preparation	98
Methodology.....	98
Experiment Participants.....	101
Results	101
Descriptive Statistics	112
Discussion	114

Chapter 5: Phase III: Triangulation Survey	124
Research Design & Preparation	124
Triangulation Survey Analysis	149
Chapter 6: Conclusion	157
Limitations	158
Validity	160
Construct Validity.....	160
Internal Validity	161
External Validity.....	162
Reliability	163
Future Research.....	164
Concluding Remarks	166
Original contributions to knowledge.....	166
Appendix A: Survey Invitation Email	168
Appendix B: Survey Instructions	169
Appendix C: Welcome Screen with Demographics Questions.....	171
Appendix D: Survey Question Screen.....	172
Appendix E: Frequency and Percentage Summaries of Best or Most Helpful Information-type During Decision-Making Regarding Remote Laboratory Adaptation in Teaching	173
Appendix F: Frequency and Percentage Summaries of Worse or Least Helpful Information-type During Decision-Making Regarding Remote Laboratory Adoption for Teaching	182
Appendix G: 1265 Individual Remote Laboratory Characteristics.....	192
Appendix H: 876 Remote Laboratory Information Characteristics	240
Appendix I: Phase I Statistics Tables.....	241
Appendix J: Phase II Experiment Process	247
Appendix K: Phase II: Statistics Tables and Figures.....	258
Appendix L: Best Minus Worst Results: Raw Data	271
Appendix M: Phase III Triangulation Survey Screen Shots	292
Appendix N: Supervisory Panel Remarks.....	296
References.....	297

List of Tables

Table 1: Publications from which papers were selected	54
Table 2: Remote laboratory information taxonomy	58
Table 3: Taxonomy with descriptors	59
Table 4: Breakdown of 876 information characteristics assignment taxonomy	64
Table 5: Alphabetical listing of institutional invitations.....	67
Table 6: Numerical listing of institutional invitations	67
Table 7: Responses by block (cohort).....	72
Table 8: Responses by gender	72
Table 9: Responses by age	73
Table 10: Responses by awareness of remote labs	73
Table 11: Responses by job title	74
Table 12: Responses by years teaching	74
Table 13: Responses by discipline.....	75
Table 14: Complete responses by institution	76
Table 15: Invites per institution	77
Table 16: Response rates by institution	78
Table 17: Complete responses	79
Table 18: Preferential ordering of remote lab information-types	80
Table 19: Combined best rank by ID.....	81
Table 20: Combined worst rank by ID.....	82
Table 21: Combined best minus worst scores, rank by ID	83
Table 22: Side-by-side best minus worst, rank by ID	84
Table 23: Side-by-site best minus worst, ranked by count.....	85
Table 24: Combined results	88
Table 25: Combined best-minus-worst outcome descriptive statistics	89
Table 26: Nearly normal distribution per three-sigma rule	89
Table 27: General information taxonomy	91
Table 21: Combined final tally.....	92
Table 29: Preference ranked ordering: naïve interpretation.....	93
Table 30: Preference ranked ordering: StdErr accounting	94
Table 31:Phase I final result	95
Table 32: Phase II experiment completions by age	102
Table 33: Phase II.....	103
Table 34: Phase II experiment completions by gender	104
Table 35: Phase II experiment completions by remote lab awareness	104
Table 36: Phase II experiment completions by remote lab use.....	104
Table 37: Phase II experiment completions by self-reported years teaching ..	105
Table 38: Invitations, clicks, starts, and completions	105
Table 39: Alpha cohort results	107
Table 40: Beta cohort results	108
Table 41: Gamma cohort results.....	109
Table 42: Combined results	110
Table 43: Steps-to-exit combined results.....	111
Table 44: Descriptive statistics inclusive of 37s	113

Table 45: Descriptive statistics, exclusive of 37s	114
Table 46: Remote laboratory information categories and types	117
Table 47: Approximate relative ranking of information-types	121
Table I1: BestMinusWorst: BestAlpha, ANOVA table	241
Table I2: BestMinusWorst: BestAlpha, measures of association	241
Table I3: BestMinusWorst: BestBeta, ANOVA table	241
Table I4: BestMinusWorst: BestBeta, measures of association	241
Table I5: BestMinusWorst: BestGamma, ANOVA table	242
Table I6: BestMinusWorst: BestGamma, measures of association	242
Table I7: BestMinusWorst: BestCount, ANOVA table	242
Table I8: BestMinusWorst: BestCount, measures of association	243
Table I9: BestMinusWorst: WorstAlpha, ANOVA table	243
Table I10: BestMinusWorst: WorstAlpha, measures of association	243
Table I11: BestMinusWorst: WorstBeta, ANOVA table	244
Table I12: BestMinusWorst: WorstBeta, measures of association	244
Table I13: BestMinusWorst: WorstGamma, ANOVA table	245
Table I14: BestMinusWorst: WorstGamma, measures of association	245
Table I15: BestMinusWorst: WorstCount, ANOVA table	245
Table I16: BestMinusWorst: WorstCount, measures of association	246
Table K1: Analysis of variance, inclusive of 37s	258
Table K2: Analysis of variance, exclusive of 37s	258
Table K3: ANOVA model summary, inclusive of 37s	258
Table K4: ANOVA model summary, exclusive of 37s	258
Table K5: ANOVA means, inclusive of 37s	258
Table K6: ANOVA means, exclusive of 37s	258
Table K7: Grouping info using the Tukey method, 95% confidence, inclusive of 37s	259
Table K8: Grouping information using the Tukey method, exclusive of 37s	259
Table K10: Tukey simultaneous tests for differences of means, inclusive of 37s	259
Table K11: Tukey simultaneous tests for differences of means, exclusive of 37s	259
Table K12: Grouping info using Fisher LSD method, 95% confidence, inclusive of 37s	261
Table K13: Grouping info using Fisher LSD method, 95% confidence, exclusive of 37s	261
Table K14: Fisher individual tests for differences of means, inclusive of 37s	261
Table J15: Fisher individual tests for differences of means, exclusive of 37s	261
Table K16: Hsu simultaneous tests for level mean, inclusive of 37s	263
Table K17: Hsu simultaneous tests for level mean, exclusive of 37s	263
Table L1: Combined: Rank by count	271
Table L2: Alpha best rank by ID	272
Table L3: Alpha best rank by count	273
Table L4: Beta best rank by ID	274
Table L5: Beta best rank by count	275
Table L6: Gamma best rank by ID	276
Table L7: Gamma best rank by count	277
Table L8: All worst, rank by count	278

Table L9: Alpha worst, rank by ID	279
Table L10: Alpha worst, rank by count.....	280
Table L11: Beta worst, rank by ID.....	281
Table L12: Beta worst, rank by count.....	282
Table L13: Gamma worst, rank by ID	283
Table L14: Gamma worst, rank by count	284
Table L15: Best minus worst combined, rank by count.....	285
Table L16: Best minus worst alpha, rank by ID.....	286
Table L17: Best minus worst alpha, rank by count.....	287
Table L18: Best minus worst beta, rank by ID	288
Table L19: Best minus worst beta, rank by count	289
Table L20: Best minus worst gamma, rank by ID.....	290
Table L21: Best minus worst gamma, rank by count	291

List of Figures

Figure 1: Motivation and justification matrix	20
Figure 2: Unified theory of technology acceptance and use.	45
Figure 3: Multimode Chart; Combined Result w/ StdDev, StdErr, and Relative Ranking.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 4: Approximate relative ranking of information-types	120
Figure J1: Welcome screen	250
Figure J2: Instructions screen	251
Figure J3: Opening experiment screen	253
Figure J5: Second experiment screen with middle confidence selected	255
Figure J6: Third experiment screen with full confidence selected	256
Figure J7: Thank you screen (experiment concluded)	257
Figure K1: Tukey differences of means for steps-to-exit, inclusive of 37s	260
Figure K2: Tukey differences of means for steps-to-exit, exclusive of 37s	260
Figure K3: Fisher differences of means for steps-to-exit, inclusive of 37s	262
Figure K4: Fisher differences of means for steps-to-exit, exclusive of 37s	262
Figure K5: Hsu simultaneous tests for level mean, inclusive of 37s.....	263
Figure K6: Hsu simultaneous tests for level mean, exclusive of 37s.....	264
Figure K7: Interval plot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, inclusive of 37s.....	264
Figure K8: Interval plot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, exclusive of 37s.....	265
Figure K9: Individual value plot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, inclusive of 37s....	265
Figure K10: Individual value plot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, exclusive of 37s..	266
Figure K11: Boxplot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, inclusive of 37s	266
Figure K12: Boxplot of steps-to-exit vs. cohort, exclusive of 37s	267
Figure K13: Histogram of steps-to-exit by cohort, inclusive of 37s.....	267
Figure K14: Histogram of steps-to-exit by cohort, exclusive of 37s.....	268
Figure K15: Individual value plot of steps-to-exit vs cohort, inclusive of 37s...	268
Figure K16: Individual value plot of steps-to-exit vs cohort, exclusive of 37s..	269
Figure K17: Boxplot of steps-to-exit vs cohort, inclusive of 37s	269
Figure K18: Boxplot of steps-to-exit vs cohort, exclusive of 37s	270

Abstract

Remote engineering instructional laboratories have become increasingly extant since their 1996 proof-of-concept inception at Oregon State University. Numerous institutional initiatives have spurred the development and deployment of increasingly sophisticated remote labs to support engineering education. The literature has likewise burgeoned from feasibility alone to include a wide range of pertinent topics relating to matters technical, organization, and pedagogical. These labs are deployed with a presumed intention of use; yet many contemporary remote lab instantiations remain underutilized. One mechanism by which remote labs are utilized is when a teacher decides to adopt a remote laboratory for instructional purposes.

This thesis presents results from a multi-phase research project that has explored the information preferences of engineering educators faced with remote laboratory adoption decisions. From the UTAUT of Venkatesh et al, it is known that facilitating conditions are among the several contributing factors that lead to individual technology adoption decisions. Relevant information is such a contributing factor. This research has determined that engineering educators *do* have information preferences when seeking to make informed decisions regarding remote lab adoption.

A four-level general taxonomy of remote laboratory information-types was emergently generated from the literature using techniques from grounded theory. The 37 second-level taxa were preferentially ordered by a cohort of engineering educators (associated with Australian universities) using a best-worst-scaling approach. A novel methodology was created to validate the preferential ordering and investigate the applicability of the remote laboratory information-type ordering. A standard-form survey was then designed to triangulate the results and affirm several key assumptions.

Engineering educators clearly prefer information about experiments that can be conducted on a remote laboratory installation over information about the institutional income that might accrue during use. Other preferences are less clear-cut. While, for example, information about collaboration afforded by remote labs is clearly preferred over information about the remote lab location, information about teacher benefits is sometimes preferred over information about

collaboration and vice versa. Though there is a preferential ordering of information-types, the ordering is a gradation, some types are clearly preferred over others; and other types are of co-equal value; dependent on individual proclivities. What the research did reveal was that remote lab information-types most relevant to the institution (e.g. income, expense) were disdained relative to pedagogical information-types (e.g. student benefits, visualization).

The triangulation survey affirmed teacher autonomy, remote lab underutilization, and the importance of relevant information to engineering educators faced with educational technology adoption decisions.